

#### REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1 to 7, 8 to 15 and 17 to 22 are pending. Claims 8 and 16 have been cancelled. Claims 23 to 29 have been cancelled as directed to a non-elected invention. No Claims are allowed.

Claims 1 to 29 were subject to a Restriction Requirement Under 35 USC 121. The Applicants elected process Claims 1 to 22 in Group I. The election was without traverse.

Independent process Claims 1, 10 and 18 have been amended to correspond to the extrusion steps of Example 1 beginning at page 25 in the specification and in cancelled Claims 8 and 16. It is this process which enables the use of the metal salts without producing the results discussed at lines 46 to 55 of Curatolo et al (U.S. Patent No. 4,481,354). It is noted that this reference does not suggest extrusion (see Example 1).

Claims 1 to 5 and 7 to 22 were rejected under 35 USC 103(a) over Sears et al (U.S. 2002/0000683 A1) in view of Cobb et al (U.S. Patent No. 6,100,320). Neither reference would render the invention of amended Claims 1 to 22 obvious to one skilled in the art alone or in combination. Sears et al does not disclose or suggest the steps (a), (b) and (c) of Claims 1, 10 or 18 involving two extrusion steps. Cobb et al deals with zinc salts of

long chain acids (organic acids) and is concerned with melt fracture and not lowering the melt temperature of the polymer. The amount used is 0.05 to 1.0 weight percent based on the polymer, whereas Applicants' use 2.5 to 5 weight percent based on the polymer. Thus Cobb et al are not concerned with lowering the melt temperature in the manner claimed by Applicants. The combination of the reference could not possibly produce the presently claimed invention. Reconsideration of this rejection is requested.


Claims 1 to 22 were rejected under 35 USC 103(a) over Sears et al in view of Curatolo et al (U.S. Patent No. 4,588,797). Sears et al has been discussed. Curatolo et al specifically mentions the problems with lithium halides at Column 1, lines 46 to 55. Applicants do not experience these problems using the dual extrusions which would be unobvious to one skilled in the art. Reconsideration is requested.

It is noted that there is no suggestion of the invention of Claim 12 involving the specific compatibilizers listed in any of the references. The rejection of these claims is clearly not supported by the references.

Attached is a revised Abstract of the Disclosure as a replacement page. Reconsideration is requested.

It is now believed that Claims 1 to 7, 8 to 15 and 17 to 22 as amended are in condition for allowance. Notice of Allowance is requested.

Respectfully,

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Ian C. McLeod

Registration No. 20,931

McLeod & Moyne, P.C.  
2190 Commons Parkway  
Okemos, Michigan 48864  
(517) 347-4100  
Fax: (517) 347-4103

Enclosure: Replacement page 47 of the Abstract